DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 289 224 EA 019 703

AUTHOR Schwartz, Arthur M.
TITLE Coping with Classroom Bigotry: Politics and Morality of Canada's Keegstra Affair.
PUB DATE 27 Aug 86
NOTE 37p.; Paper presented at the International Intervisitation Programme in Educational Administration (Auckland, New Zealand, August 24-29, 1986). Assisted by a grant from the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada.
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrator Education; *Anti Semitism; Boards of Education; Court Litigation; Decision Making; Foreign Countries; Freedom of Speech; Higher Education; High Schools; Jews; *Moral Issues; *Politics of Education; Principals; Propaganda; Public Schools; *Social Discrimination; Social Studies; Standards; Superintendents; Teacher Administrator Relationship; Teacher Associations; *Teacher Dismissal; Teacher Rights
IDENTIFIERS *Alberta

ABSTRACT

In December 1982, James Keegstra was dismissed from his position as high school social studies teacher in a small Canadian town. Two and one-half years later Keegstra was convicted on the rarely heard criminal charge of willful promotion of hatred towards an identifiable group (Jews) through his classroom teaching. Courtroom testimony made it clear that two successive principals of the school and the former superintendent of the school district had sheltered Keegstra by ignoring or failing to act on parental complaints. The two principals appeared as defense witnesses on behalf of Keegstra who argued that the approved curriculum was biased and that the school was interfering with his right of free speech. The principals' testimony raises concern about the selection and training of school administration and the functions and dysfunctions of ignorance, morality, and short-term expedience in the management of public education. The positivist technicism widespread in graduate departments of educational administration facilitates the avoidance of issues involving difficult matters of morality and ethics. Those who teach school administration need to ask what they are doing to give students the knowledge and attitudes that will keep them from becoming barbarians. Fifty notes are appended. (MLF)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED289224

COPING WITH CLASSROOM BIGOTRY: THE POLITICS AND MORALITY OF CANADA'S KEEGSTRA AFFAIR

Presented to the Sixth International Intervisitation Programme
in Educational Administration
Auckland, New Zealand,
August 27, 1986

by

Arthur M. Schwartz
Department of Educational Policy and Administrative Studies
The University of Calgary
Calgary, Alberta, T2N 1N4
Canada

Presentation of this paper was assisted by a grant from the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada

EA 019703

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Arthur M. Schwartz

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Introduction

In December 1982, James Keegstra was dismissed from his position as high school social studies teacher in a small Canadian town. The sequence of events surrounding this dismissal and culminating in his conviction two and one-half years later on the rarely heard criminal charge of willful promotion of hatred towards an identifiable group[1] (through his classroom teaching) are of some import for the administration of public education. Courtroom testimony made it clear that two successive principals of the school and the former superintendent of the school district had sheltered Keegstra for a decade by ignoring or failing to act on parental complaints. They appear to have done so, among other possibilities, out of an amoral pragmatism intended to keep things quiet in the school and district, or because they did not or could not themselves recognize the implications of his teaching.

What has become known as the "Keegstra Affair" cannot be taken in isolation as an example of the deficiencies of small-town school management. Rather, it indicates the extent to which even small-town school affairs are linked to the mainstream of provincial political life in Canada. It was an embarrassment for the government of the province, portraying an aspect of life in Alberta which was out of keeping with the image of a future-oriented and technologically sophisticated environment featured in a contemporary white paper on the Provincial economy.[2] For the Alberta Teachers' Association (ATA), it was a stimulus for internal conflict, a public relations disaster, and a political reversal. It became a focal point in an on-going contest between successive ministers of education and the ATA over control of teaching standards and the teaching profession itself. It intensified to bitter levels a conflict between supporters and opponents of the provincial government's policy of grants to

private schools. Indirectly, it also became part of the competition to succeed the Premier of Alberta after his retirement from political life late in 1985. These events were part of the larger matrix of Alberta politics.

But the Keegstra affair went beyond politics to raise questions about a fundamental element in the management of public education in democratic states -- the role of the principal or head of school in assuring and maintaining the quality of classroom experience of students. Here was a case where hatred had been part of the high school curriculum for a decade, and where the teacher in question argued that the approved curriculum was biased and that his right to free speech in the classroom was being unjustly interfered with. The two principals under whose direction he had worked appeared as defence witnesses on his behalf. Their testimony raises concerns about the selection and training of school administrators and the functions and dysfunctions of ignorance, morality, and short-term expedience in the management of public education.

The Facts of The Case

The dismissal of James Keegstra was reported in the local and regional press, but gained little wider attention, despite the fact that at the time, Keegstra was mayor of Eckville, the town of 870 people where the school was located. His appeal to a Board of Reference under the Alberta School Act and subsequent events were widely reported in Canada, and to some extent internationally. That appeal was rejected; Keegstra has since been expelled from the Alberta Teachers' Association, which had defended him before his school board and the Board of Reference. The provincial Minister of Education has suspended his teaching certificate, making him unemployable in public schools; he has been defeated in municipal and federal elections (the latter event had occurred twice before) and in a later attempt to become national leader of his fringe political party; and his was only the second case to result

in conviction by a Canadian jury for the willful promotion of hatred. The guilty verdicts in the previous case were overturned on appeal; Keegstra's appeal has not yet been heard.

James Keegstra does not like Jews. He blames all his troubles on the same alleged international Jewish conspiracy about which he taught his students in great detail, with passion, with conviction, and with an air of authority. That conspiracy, he taught, was responsible for most of the great disasters of western history -- not merely the Great Depression of the 1930's, but also the French Revolution, the First and Second World Wars, and the Vietnam conflict. The conspiracy had also fabricated evidence of the Nazi destruction of the Jews of Europe, which had never really occurred; it was all merely a Zionist plot to gain sympathy. The conspiracy, he told his students, was everywhere. It controlled the world economy; it controlled text book publishers and distorted the contents of authorized texts and standard reference books. He informed his students that the truth about Jewish conspiracy and Zionist plot could be found in his personal library, from which they were welcome to borrow. His students testified that good marks came from returning to him the material he presented in class, and not by working from standard references or mainstream historians. Essays based upon independent research in standard sources were marked down with warnings about propaganda.[3]

Keegstra appears to have taught effectively. Testimony by former students and reports of interviews with them indicate that he inculcated his views in many, and left others unsure about just what to believe.[4]

In three successive hearings, Keegstra was advised and assisted by the Alberta Teachers' Association under its policy that "The Association's legal services are withheld only when the teacher's conduct has previously been the subject of an Association investigation that has proven grounds for

non-support."[5] The first two hearings were before the County of Lacombe Board of Education, his former employer, where he argued successfully the first time (February 9, 1982) and unsuccessfully the second (December 7, 1982) against the Superintendent of School's recommendation that he be dismissed. Keegstra then appealed his dismissal and was again assisted by the ATA, which paid his legal costs. The Board of Reference set up under the Alberta School Act to hear the appeal sat for 6 days in March 1983. This was the first public exposure of the details of Keegstra's teaching, and the proceedings were well attended. The judge's ruling was issued on April 14, dismissing Keegstra's appeal on the grounds that he had "refused to comply with the lawful and reasonable direction of his employer...[and]...also refused to comply with the Alberta Social Studies Curriculum." The Reasons For Decision continued, "The Board [i.e., Board of Education] had before it sufficient evidence to support the conclusion that it reached," and "the reasons given for the termination of the contract...constitute sufficient grounds for summary dismissal." The judge also found that the Board of Education had "acted fairly, and without bias."[6]

The publicity associated with the Board of Reference proceedings resulted in requests to the ATA from at least two of its local associations for proceedings to be started against Keegstra under the Association's disciplinary by-laws. A second member of the ATA's professional staff (not the same one who had assisted him before the Board of Education and the Board of Reference) conducted an investigation and then prosecuted Keegstra before the Association's Discipline Committee early in October. The Committee found that Keegstra had violated the ATA's Standards of Professional Conduct and "brought such disrepute to his profession and the Association that he is deemed by the Committee to be no longer worthy of membership."[7] The Committee recommended that he be expelled from the Association, and that a

recommendation be made to the Minister of Education to suspend his teaching certificate. The Association's Executive Council accepted the recommendations and acted accordingly. The Minister announced that he would comply with the request.

Discipline Committee hearings are closed, and their outcomes are announced only as general statements of Committee activities published months afterwards in the Associations bi-weekly newspaper, with no identification of the teachers in question. The Keegstra hearing was reported late in February 1984, taking up 31 column inches of tabloid space.[8]

Keegstra had one more avenue of appeal with respect to ATA membership and his teaching certificate. A Teaching Profession Appeal Board was convened in February 1984 under the provisions of the Alberta Teaching Profession Act, which gives the ATA its disciplinary powers and provides for appeals of Executive Council disciplinary actions. On February 15, the Board ruled that Keegstra "shows absolutely no repentance and a firm conviction to carry on with an objectionable and unprofessional course of conduct...there is no room in the teaching profession for a teacher such as Mr. Keegstra."[9] The appeal was dismissed. In April, Keegstra's teaching certificate was finally suspended. He could no longer teach in public schools.

The Attorney-General of the province had ordered a police investigation after seeing the Board of Reference transcript. The promotion of hatred charge, which was added to the Criminal Code of Canada in 1970, is seldom used; many lawyers believe its built-in defences make conviction virtually impossible; civil libertarians tend to argue against the law; and there was the possibility that the public forum of a trial would bring out still more of the expressions of bigotry and hatred which had been increasing since the affair began. After the senior Crown Prosecutor who would eventually conduct the

case decided there were grounds for conviction, and with the agreement of the Premier of the province,charges were laid against James Keegstra in January 1984 under section 281.2(2) of the Criminal Code.[10]

A preliminary hearing in June 1984 found that the evidence did justify going to trial. Keegstra then applied for a stay of proceedings, arguing inter alia that the section of the Criminal Code under which the charge had been laid was an infringement of the right to freedom of expression under the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms, which is the supreme law of the land. Section 2 of the Charter begins:

> 2. Everyone has the following fundamental freedoms:
>
> (a) freedom of conscience and religion;
>
> (b) freedom of thought, belief, opinion and expression, including freedom of the press and other media of communication;

The judge who heard the application ruled that the freedom of speech provision of Section 2(b) "does not mean an absolute freedom permitting an unbridged (sic) right of speech or expression." He cited both Canadian and United States precedent to establish that the Criminal Code provisions did not exceed the restrictions of Section 1 of the Charter:

> 1. The Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms guarantees the rights and freedoms set out in it subject only to such reasonable limits prescribed by law as can be demonstrably justified in a free and democratic society.

He cited two other Charter provisions in rejecting Keegstra's application:

> 15(1). Every individual is equal before and under the law and has the right to the equal protection and equal benefit of the law without discrimination and, in particular, without

> discrimination based on race, national or ethnic origin, colour, religion, sex, age or mental or physical disability.
>
> 27. This Charter shall be interpreted in a manner consistent with the preservation and enhancement of the multicultural heritage of Canadians.

In the light of these Charter provisions, continued the judge, the phrase "freedom of expression" cannot be rationally interpreted "as including the freedom to publicly and willfully promote hatred against a section of the Canadian public distinguished by colour, race, religion or ethnic origin." The application for a stay of proceedings was rejected.[11] The ruling is an important constitutional precedent.

The trial began in April 1985, with 23 former students appearing as witnesses; their essays and notebooks were entered as evidence. The Superintendent of Schools, some of Keegstra's fellow teachers, his teaching replacement, both principals of the high school during his time there as a teacher, a member of the school board, and some others appeared as witnesses. Keegstra's own testimony and cross-examination lasted twenty-six days; the prosecutor described his time on the witness stand as a confession under oath. On July 20, 1985, the jury found him guilty, and the judge imposed a $5,000 fine, although the maximum sentence for the offense is two years imprisonment. Keegstra's appeal of the verdict and the Crown's appeal of the sentence are expected to be heard in October 1986.

In December 1985, Keegstra's lawyer was granted an injunction preventing the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation from airing a television drama about the dismissal of a small-town history teacher with anti-Semitic views. The injunction was effective only in Alberta; the program was broadcast elsewhere in Canada and received indifferent reviews.[12] Both the Canadian Civil

Liberties Association and its Calgary affiliate have sought leave to intervene in the CBC's appeal against the injunction. The appeal court's decision on that application has not been rendered at the time of writing.

Later that same month, two Ontario men who published a magazine advocating white power were convicted of willful promotion of hatred and given jail terms. In passing sentence, the judge referred to the Keegstra fine as "woefully inadequate."[13]

In June 1986, Keegstra ran for the leadership of the Social Credit Party of Canada. A convention of 114 delegates elected an evangelical minister from Ontario, whom Keegstra promptly attacked as a racist. Keegstra declared himself to be the victim of a smear campaign, arguing that he had been convicted under "Satanic hate laws conceived in Hell" and enforced by "enemies of Christ and servants of Satan."[14]

The sequence of events surrounding Keegstra's dismissal, loss of teaching certificate and eventual conviction provide an example of a school system caught unawares and unprepared for the revelation of human inadequacies within it. The same events also provide a case study of how basic moral issues may become outweighed in public education by power struggles and the defence of prerogative and territory by various interests. Throughout the Keegstra affair, people acted not in terms of the moral issues at hand, but in terms of the potential effects of their actions on other issues in which they or their institutional interests were involved.

The Superintendent

The fundamental reality of a school superintendent's daily existence is the necessity of working within the tolerance or zone of acceptance of the board of trustees by which he or she is employed. Superintendents in Alberta are the chief executive officers of their school districts, but they are also individually

contracted employees of their boards. It is either a foolish, brave, or principled superintendent in any jurisdiction who places a controversial issue before his or her board without first analyzing how the trustees line up on either side of the issue and what the various bargaining ploys and trade-offs might be among items on the public and private agendas of individual board members. A successful superintendent -- one might even say one long in office or a survivor -- prepares the ground first, investing time and energy in readying trustees to favourably receive the superintendent's initiatives, and tallying his or her counters with each board member as one issue or vote succeeds another. Superintendents thus work <u>at</u> as well as <u>for</u> their boards.[15] This is particularly the case in personnel matters with rural boards whose members are area representatives well acquainted with the small populations who elect them and with the teachers in <u>their</u> local schools. Keegstra's prominence in his town is evident from the fact that even after his dismissal from the teaching staff he nevertheless officiated as mayor at the opening ceremonies for a reconstructed portion of the school in which he had taught.

Any superintendent faces a dilemma when having to deal with an issue having a universalist moral element which may not be part of a more particularist local view of the world and on which immediate action must be taken. These are not necessarily issues in which local preference varies from more universalist morality, but may rather be matters which are not considered locally to be issues at all.[16] The dilemma lies in weighing the cost to the superintendent's credibility of making an issue out of something which is not perceived to be one, against the greater good which might come from immediately forcing a major issue which the board may not initially be prepared to face or on which trustees may not be willing to accept the superintendent's recommendations.

When Robert David's attention was drawn to a parent complaint about Keegstra's teaching in December 1981, he had been Superintendent of Schools for the County of Lacombe for two years. He visited the school the next day, interviewed students, examined their notebooks and essays, and directed Keegstra to cease teaching his Jewish conspiracy theories immediately and return to the authorized curriculum. He then put these instructions in writing, placed a report of the incident on the agenda for the next Board of Education meeting, and prepared a package of related materials for distribution to Board members before the meeting. That package included copies of student work and his written instructions to Keegstra.

At that Board meeting, David's actions were unanimously approved, and a minority of trustees, including the Eckville representative, argued for Keegstra's immediate dismissal. Caution prevailed, however; Keegstra was called to appear before the next Board meeting a month later, and David wrote to inform him that termination of his employment would be considered at that time. Keegstra immediately called the Alberta Teachers' Association for assistance.

It is not easy to dismiss a teacher in Alberta. The judges who constitute Boards of Reference set a high standard of proof. It is not uncommon for school boards to lose Board of Reference appeals on procedural grounds, with judges supporting the Alberta Teachers' Association arguments that natural justice has been denied the teacher in question. For a typical dismissal to be sustained on appeal, the school board must prove that the teacher's classes were observed by an appropriate official, that an appropriate diagnosis was made of the teacher's faults, that appropriate corrective action was prescribed, that a reasonable amount of time was allowed for the teacher to change his or her ways, and that a reasonable amount of appropriately spaced follow-up

observation also occurred. Whatever Keegstra may have been teaching, these conditions had not been met by that Board of Education meeting in January.

Keegstra appeared at a special in camera session attached to the regular February Board meeting. Supported by the presence of an Alberta Teachers' Association staff member, "he taught the Board his Jewish conspiracy theory" for over an hour.[17] There was now little doubt about what he believed, but there was still not much in the way of evidence about his classroom work which was likely to be acceptable to a Board of Reference. Despite what the Superintendent later referred to as "how vigorously I argued" for Keegstra's dismissal,[18] David was instructed by the Board to give Keegstra specific directives to follow in his classroom practice. These directives, together with the earlier written instructions, became the basis for the eventual dismissal.

David's actions must be contrasted with those of his predecessor, who held the superintendency for seven years. A number of parent complaints about Keegstra had been received during that time. In the early 1970's, these had been about anti-Catholic teaching. Nothing seemed to have been done in response, despite the fact that Catholic students in Keegstra's classes were occasionally his targets. Some Catholic parents withdrew their children from the school. In 1978, parental complaints about anti-Catholic, anti-Jewish, and anti-Irish teaching led David's predecessor to tell Keegstra to moderate his classroom statements. The instructions were oral, and the superintendent was satisfied that Keegstra would comply. The parents' letters of complaint were filed away, where David would find them three years later. Nothing else seems to have been done.

In September 1985, after Keegstra's trial and sentence, Robert David was elected to the Board of Directors of the Canadian Education Association. That election constituted recognition by the Canadian educational establishment. His

predecessor remains in bureaucratic obscurity as an administration consultant in a regional office of the Alberta Ministry of Education.

The Principals

There had been two principals of Eckville Junior-Senior High School during Keegstra's time there as a teacher. Both appeared as defence witnesses at his trial. Their testimony was startling in its revelations. The first had left the principalship in 1975. He testified that he had tried to have Keegstra removed from teaching social studies out of concern for his own children, who were in the school at the time. He also did not want Keegstra in social studies "so I wouldn't have to answer for what he was teaching." He knew about Keegstra's anti-semitism and had also received complaints that Keegstra was "inordinately critical of the Russians," but did not follow through on the transfer plans because he was "afraid of making waves and causing community dissatisfaction." Instead, he left to be principal elsewhere in the county, returning to the school a year later as a teacher. He had not visited Keegstra's classroom while principal because he believed it to be under effective control. He had testified earlier to the Board of Reference that Keegstra's "command of discipline" was his "first qualification" as a teacher. He also felt that Keegstra had "a tremendous knowledge of his subject."

His successor, promoted from vice-principal in his place, had received complaints about Keegstra as early as 1976. He did not regard complaints received before David acted in 1981 as serious, and kept no records of them. He testified that Keegstra did "a very thorough job" of preparation for classes, and was "reasonably tolerant. I never heard him call down another group except for maybe Communists or Zionists." Besides, while he conceded that he should have known the content of teachers' classes, it had not been his job to

evaluate them. That was the responsibility of senior officials, and his own teaching load did not allow much time for such things.

In fairness to the two principals and the former superintendent, it must be emphasized that Keegstra is a personable individual for all his fanaticism, and was an effective disciplinarian, well-liked by most of his students, and a major figure in the community. Besides, there were no Jews in Eckville to complain. There were, however, people who whatever their religious denomination and degree of observance, were determined not to have their children's minds impregnated with Keegstra's views. Until David's arrival in the superintendency, their complaints had no effect. In December 1981, they were acted upon promptly.

The second principal was correct in his views on the locus of responsibility for classroom supervision, at least in terms of the letter of the law. The Alberta School Act specifies only that there shall be a designated principal for each school. Neither the Act nor its Regulations provide responsibility statements for principals. Nor did the County of Lacombe Board of Education have a definite policy on such matters at the time in question. It does now.

The two principals did have to live and work in a small community, where the teacher in question was the generally well-liked mayor of the town, who whatever the content of his teaching, kept order and won the respect of most of his students. But that does not excuse the failure of those principals to act. At least one of them might not have recognized the difference between a lesson's content and the way in which it was delivered. The other left the scene without seeming to address the problem, thus rendering the distinction of no import. For both principals, potential concerns were kept from growing into issues that might have called for decisions by a conjunction of dominant values

in the school and community, by the accepted rules of action and definition of the situation, and by the power relationships between a principal without defined responsibilities on the one hand, and a popular teacher/mayor on the other. From a political perspective, when such combinations of circumstances

> effectively prevent certain grievances from developing into full-fledged issues which call for decisions, it can be said that a nondecision-making situation exists. This phenomenon is clearly distinguishable from the negative aspects of decision-making (deciding not to act or deciding not to decide), since the mere existence of the 'mobilization of bias', to use Schattschneider's phrase, is sufficient to prevent a latent issue from becoming a question for decision.[19]

There were no decisions to be made about Keegstra's teaching because Keegstra's teaching was not perceived to be an issue. And if Keegstra's teaching was not perceived to be an issue, there were certainly no moral implications of his teaching and its potential effects on students to be considered.

But it is difficult to imagine for at least the two principals, if not the former superintendent, that they remained unaware of Keegstra's views. The school was too small, the people in it cast too close together, the views too extreme and their advocacy too strident, for at least the two principals not to have known of them. And there had been complaints.

One cannot conclude, however, that merely because these administrators did not follow up on parent complaints, that they were supporting Keegstra and his cause. Perhaps they were merely being amoral pragmatists. Parents did not take their complaints any further, and that was that. A potential issue had been defused, at least in the short term. The implicit assumption that complaints would go no further had been correct.

It might even be argued that doing nothing in response to complaints could be considered rational behaviour, in a strictly technical sense. If this were the case, conscious decisions to do nothing would have been based upon logical consideration of the costs and benefits of alternative courses of action weighed one against the other. Not pursuing the complaints certainly kept things quiet, at least for awhile. Moral questions of good and evil are not relevant from this perspective, as long as the objects of the exercise were attained.

But a technically rational administrative decision is not necessarily a right decision.[20] Questions of right and wrong involve abstract moral considerations that seemed to lie outside the worldview of the people initially involved here.

Another alternative is the possibility that the school officials in question simply may have been too ignorant to recognize the import of what was occurring on their own turf. They would not be alone, were this the explanation. Ignorance of the connotations of the Nazi Holocaust as institutionalized evil of the highest order is not limited to the principal's office of an obscure school in an obscure town thirty miles off the main road between two cities in western Canada. President Reagan and his advisors were unprepared for the widespread protest which followed his wreath-laying visit to a German military cemetery which contained S.S. graves.[21]

The ignorance thesis is tempting; it is perhaps the most charitable to the administrators involved. Despite this temptation to be charitable, however, the question of morality in school administration remains. We are dealing here with a question of knowledge of the difference between good and evil. To Western eyes, the embodiment of evil in the Nazi Holocaust does not lie only in the fact that the systematic industrialized destruction of an entire people was undertaken as a matter of state policy and national effort, but also that it was conducted by a nation whose accomplishments -- industrial, technological,

scientific, literary, artistic, musical -- over the centuries together represented the peak of Western European civilization. And that state enterprise was organized and directed by ordinary bureaucrats doing their jobs in what has been labelled "the banality of evil."[22]

To prepare such ordinary people to participate in and support genocide as an act of state policy, it is necessary first to create an attitude which excludes the victims from "the universe of obligation of the dominant group...that circle of persons toward whom obligations are owed, to whom the rules apply, and whose injuries call for expiation by the community."[23] The testimony of his former students and the attitudes some of them expressed when interviewed[24] strongly suggest that Keegstra's classes could be the first step in bringing about that state of mind. The European experience of the Twentieth Century suggests that the end product of that state of mind can be concentration camps and gas ovens -- or the Armenian massacres or the Katyn Forest or the extermination of the Beothuks or the depredations of Pol Pot. The first step is simply to provide a sheltered environment and a captive audience so that teaching can continue. By failing to act effectively on complaints against Keegstra, the administrators in question provided that shelter.

An administrative decision -- any decision made in the course of directing the operations of a school -- is both a moral act and an act of intention and will.[25] Yet in the amorality of their approach, if amoral it was, the Eckville principals may not have been inconsistent with the general tenets of their field. The positivist technicism which was widespread in graduate departments of educational administration in the 1960's and 1970's, and which remains with us into the 1980's may in part have been so popular just because it facilitated the avoidance of issues involving difficult matters of morality and ethics.

Because of the power a principal has to shape the structure and reality of a school, administrative decisions in educational settings create, at least in part, the reality which children experience as schooling, and which accordingly shapes them. There is a substantial and growing body of research literature on school effectiveness and on the principal's role in determining the character of a school and thus the substance, scope and quality of the educational experience of its students.[26] In the latter connection one need only to refer to the works of Morris, Crowson and their colleagues, the present author, and Wolcott for examples of the ways in which principals are able to create unique learning environments in their schools through "creative insubordination," the imposition of their personal philosophies of education on their schools, selective exclusion of unwanted environmental influences from community and school system, and the entrepreneurial construction and maintenance of both bridges and barriers between schools and their immediate environments.[27]

Evans makes a relevant distinction here:

> "We have to contrast a mere administrative view of school life with an educational administrative view of school life. A principal who is guided by an educational administrative orientation always sees his or her actions as an answer to the question of the meaning of education." (Original emphasis.)[28]

That vision of the meaning of education and of what the school should be attempting to accomplish cannot but have its value component, and, one would hope, an image of the adults its students might become. Greenfield argues,

> Inevitably, then, there is a moral dimension to the administrator's decisions. And there is an inevitable moral dimension to the administrator who decides and acts, for he is responsible not only for himself but for others as well.

> Even if the responsibility is only personal, the moral dimension cannot be avoided...[29]

In discussing the principalship, one is drawn inevitably to Harry Wolcott:

> On the dimension of maintaining the quality of institutional responsiveness those in the principal's office face a constant challenge...it is their vigilance that is being evoked...(original emphasis.)[30]

In Eckville, there appears to have been neither vision, nor the underlying knowledge on which to base it, nor vigilance. Therein lies the crux of the failure of school administration in the Keegstra affair.

The Alberta Teachers' Association

For the ATA, things did not go well in the Keegstra affair. It was in a losing position almost from the moment the staff officer who received Keegstra's initial request for assistance went to his aid before the Board of Education without appearing to check the content of the student papers upon which the dismissal proceedings were based. The Association failed from the very beginning to effectively establish before the media and in the minds of its members and critics the distinction on the one hand between its commitment that teachers threatened with the loss of their livelihood receive fair hearings whatever their alleged deficiencies or offenses, and on the other hand, rejection of the content of Keegstra's teaching.

The Board of Reference decision was announced on a Thursday. The following Monday, an Opposition member asked in the Legislative Assembly about withdrawal of Keegstra's teaching certificate. The Minister of Education made it clear that while only he could withdraw the certificate, the Teacher's Association would have to ask first. This was "virtually" the only way a Minister ever acted on such matters.[31] Four days later, in response to another

question, this time from a Government member who was himself a high school principal and often asked questions which provided openings for Ministerial announcements on education, the Minister stated that the President of the ATA had informed him that same morning that there had still been no request for internal disciplinary action against Keegstra. The Minister continued that he had been informed later in the day that such a request had been received.[32] Keegstra had become another incident in a political dispute over control of teaching standards that had been going on between the ATA and a succession of Ministers of Education for years.

The ATA is empowered to expel teachers from membership but must ask the Minister to cancel certificates, something which, under the School Act, only he can do. The procedures are set out in the Association's disciplinary by-laws, but the Teaching Profession Act requires that such by-laws be approved by the Government, which had not been sympathetic to requests for increased ATA influence over teacher certification and teaching standards. The Association itself could not initiate disciplinary action since its Discipline Committee is empowered to inquire into complaints received and then only to make recommendations to the Executive Council, which then imposes whatever penalties it feels may be appropriate (or no penalties at all). A complaint had to come from the membership at large or from outside the Association. For the executive arm of the Association (the Executive Council), which would itself impose a penalty, to commence disciplinary action leading to that penalty would be contrary to natural justice and grounds for eventual appeal against that penalty. The ATA could not act against Keegstra on its own. The few days that it took for the first complaint to come in cost the Association dearly in that it was perceived not to act against him despite the evidence.

The ATA's political and public relations difficulties were compounded further when the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation's national evening television newsmagazine program, "The Journal," covered the Keegstra affair on May 2, 1983. A brief clip, taken out of context from a much longer interview, gave the impression that the ATA staffer who had assisted Keegstra was defending his right to misrepresent history and teach his own particular version of hatred and bigotry. This broadcast not only drew national attention to the events, but also focussed the critical attention of the ATA's membership on its elected executive and professional staff.

The ATA did in fact respond effectively once a complaint had been received. A different staff officer conducted an investigation and then successfully prosecuted Keegstra at an internal Discipline Committee hearing in October 1983. He used essentially the same evidence that was heard by the Board of Reference and would be heard again as part of the Crown's case in the criminal trail. The investigation took time, and summer vacation caused more delay. Though the time interval was not excessive under the circumstances, and the case sufficiently well put together that it provided no procedural grounds for appeal, the ATA once again was seen not to act quickly and effectively. It was only after Keegstra's appeal against the ATA's disciplinary action had been rejected (in April 1984) that the Association could formally request cancellation of his certificate.

The Minister took advantage of the ATA's loss of public sympathy (and its executive's damaged status in the eyes of its membership) to resolve the dispute over control of teaching by creating a "Council on Alberta Teaching Standards" to advise him on such matters. He later made some concessions to the ATA on the Council's structure and agreed to re-open negotiations on a

new Teaching Profession Act. The initiative had clearly been taken by the Minister.

The Provincial Government

The Keegstra affair was an embarrassment for the Conservative government of Alberta. That embarrassment must be seen in historical context.

Keegstra had twice run for Parliament as a candidate of the Social Credit Party of Canada. The Alberta Social Credit Party had formed the provincial government in 1935 and remained in power until 1971, when it was defeated by the Progressive Conservatives led by Peter Lougheed, who was in office during the Keegstra affair. There was a strong anti-semitic element in the depression-era philosophy of the original Social Credit government. Its first leader, William Aberhart, had been a high school principal and radio evangelist whose own views on the anti-semitic parts of Social Credit doctrine were ambiguous and contradictory. While he publically denounced anti-semitism, he also established the Social Credit Board, a government agency whose task became to spread Social Credit doctrine and proselytize for it. His successor, Ernest Manning, who came into office when Aberhart died, conducted a purge of the anti-semitic elements from the party and disbanded the Social Credit Board in 1947.

After Manning's retirement, the Alberta Social Credit Party began to wither away. After Lougheed's retirement late in 1985, the two remaining Social Credit members of the provincial Legislative Assembly reconstituted themselves as the "Representative Party." No Social Credit candidates stood for office in the May 1986 election.

There is an irony in the embarrassment which the Keegstra affair brought to the Conservative government. Both Aberhart and Manning had been populist radio evangelists; the former had founded and the latter had been the first

graduate of the Calgary Prophetic Bible Institute (which Keegstra had also attended). Lougheed had been a corporation lawyer and graduate of the Harvard School of Business, with links to multinational boardrooms. The backgrounds and personal styles of the leaders, and the ethos' of government had differed greatly under the two regimes; but the provincial school system under Lougheed had harboured undetected and unchastened a bizarre element of early Social Credit populism which both Aberhart and Manning had publicly denounced in their day, and which Manning had expunged.[33]

The government's embarrassment over Keegstra was compounded a few days after the Board of Reference decision, when the province's major newspapers carried an interview with a backbench Conservative Member of the Legislative Assembly. That rural MLA's views on the Holocaust were similar to those of Keegstra. The matter was discussed in the Conservative caucus; the Premier spoke to the MLA, who made a qualified apology in the Legislature; the Attorney-General then read a statement which disassociated the government from the MLA's earlier remarks.[34]

Two weeks later, the Premier read a statement in the Legislature announcing three actions the government would take: the Human Rights Commission would undertake a public education program to combat racism and discrimination; and the Minister of Education would set in motion both a curriculum review and a review of school monitoring procedures.

At the end of June, the Minister announced the establishment of the Commission on Tolerance and Understanding, which would hold public hearings across the province, and make recommendations on the fostering of tolerance, and respect for human rights, freedoms, dignity and the worth of individuals. Its Chairman would be Ron Ghitter, a former Conservative MLA who had been responsible for the development of the province's human rights legislation.

Alberta's minorities were well-represented on the Committee. Its members included, among others, a prominent Franco-Albertan Catholic school trustee, a Moslem physician, a Native Indian, a Chinese Member of the Legislative Assembly, and a cerebral palsy victim; the Chairman was Jewish.

The Committee's first "Discussion Paper" dealt with private schools. It attacked the curricula and practices of a small number of independent schools, mostly Christian fundamentalist, as intolerant and socially divisive.[35] The irony that a Committee set up as a result of the teaching of hatred in public schools chose to attack private schools for intolerance was not lost on critics of the Committee and the government. Private school circles reacted with indignation, and some of the Committee's subsequent public meetings were marked by angry confrontations. A few operators of unlicensed private schools have been prosecuted; the first of those cases has been appealed as far as the Supreme Court of Canada, where Pastor Larry Jones is arguing that the province's requirement that he apply for a permit to run his church basement school is a denial of the freedom of religion guaranteed by the Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

The Committee's second discussion paper, on native education, began:

> The general state of Native education in Alberta is deplorable.
>
> The failure to respond to the special needs of Native students has been a shameful act of intolerance and misunderstanding.[36]

Twelve of the more than 2,000 textbooks and other curriculum materials eventually reviewed were found to be unacceptable because of sexual stereotyping or misrepresentation of minorities. These have by now been taken out of use in Alberta schools. When a national study was undertaken of the

treatment of the Holocaust in a representative collection of textbooks used in schools across Canada, Alberta's authorized texts were found least inadequate. Alberta was the only western province (one of only three altogether) with an authorized text whose treatment of the Holocaust was rated "satisfactory."[37]

Following Premier Lougheed's announcement of his intention to resign in the Autumn of 1985, Ron Ghitter ran for the leadership of the Progressive Conservative party. The visibility gained as chairman of the Committee on Tolerance and Understanding was a factor in his campaign, which was marred by some anti-semitic incidents. At the leadership convention, he placed third out of three finalists. Keegstra had indirectly become a factor in the Lougheed succession.

The Minister of Education during all of these events, David King, was one of the first to enter the leadership succession race, but withdrew early. The new premier shifted his portfolio in a cabinet shuffle. He was then defeated in the 1986 provincial election.

While the events described above were going on, the legislation governing education in Alberta was under review. The Ministry of Education issued a document in January 1985 listing questions to be addressed in the review, and inviting comment.[38] A committee of MLA's received briefs, and heard presentations by their authors. Among the areas of discussion were training programs for school administrators, provincial licensing or certification of principals, and the inclusion of specific responsibility statements for principals in legislation. Keegstra came up often in briefs and presentations. Release of the draft legislation has been delayed twice with the appointment of new Ministers of Education.

In the spring of 1984, the Annual Representatives Assembly of the Alberta Teachers' Association added a new section at the end of its Code of Ethics:

> 10. The teacher teaches in a manner that respects the dignity and rights of all persons without prejudice as to race, religious beliefs, color, sex, physical characteristics, age, ancestry or place of origin.

One year later, at the 1985 Annual Representative Assembly, the ATA introduced a new Code of Professional Conduct, amending and combining both the previous Code of Ethics and Standards of Professional Conduct. Cabinet approval of the new Code was announced by the then Minister of Education in a speech to the 1986 Annual Representative Assembly. Its first section is the one added to the Code of Ethics in 1984.

Conclusion

Keegstra had not been dismissed from his position specifically for teaching hatred but for refusing to follow the authorized curriculum and for ignoring the lawful instructions of his school board. He was expelled from the Alberta Teachers Association for

> ...unprofessional conduct in that he excessively or flagrantly breached the Alberta Teachers Association Standards of Professional Conduct...in that he...failed to act in a manner as to maintain the honor and prestige of his profession.[39]

There was nothing either in school law or professional standards (both are provincial jurisdiction in Canada) which directly proscribed the teaching of hatred. Only in the Criminal Code (federal law) was there any direct statutory basis for action against Keegstra -- and the jury deliberated for 30 hours before delivering a guilty verdict.

There was one more interest to be heard from. The Alberta School Trustees Association[40] had awaited the Board of Reference decision with apprehension. Its staff lawyer had advised the Lacombe County Board of Education in the matter, and there was a procedural question -- the same question the ATA was using in Keegstra's defence: had there been enough documented classroom observation? Had the Board of Education "sufficiently investigated the Apellant's teaching program to reach the conclusion that he was not complying with the Curriculum or the Board's directive"?[41] The school principal had not been involved. He would later testify at the trial as a defence witness.

Both the ASTA and the ATA were concerned with matters of procedure and precedent. Could a Board of Education act, as had been done in this case, without extensive classroom observation and without direct involvement of a school principal in dismissing a teacher? There was also the question of a possible return to provincially employed inspectors of schools, owing no allegiance to local boards. These had made regular visits to schools until the early 1970's when the inspectorial function had been abandoned, and replaced with supervision by senior officials employed by local boards.

Immediately after the Board of Reference decision had confirmed the dismissal, the Trustee's Association emphasized in press releases and in a letter from its President to the chairmen of member boards, that the Board of Reference had reinforced the viability of autonomous local school boards as guardians of the rights of children. That decision, argued the ASTA, had demonstrated that there was no need to return to provincially-employed Inspectors of Schools. The autonomy of locally-elected boards of school trustees had been preserved.

All three major actors in Alberta's educational politics had recast the Keegstra affair in terms of their own political agendas. The Alberta School Trustees Association had played a minor role, providing legal advice to the Lacombe board but otherwise waiting in the wings. The Alberta Teacher's Association had lost the initiative early in the campaign and fought a losing rearguard action from then on. The Minister had struck hard against the Teachers' Association when the opportunity presented itself, and had prevailed.

To be fair, it must be emphasized that all three had strongly denounced Keegstra's teachings, although the ATA took longer than it should have to do so. The Minister of Education's denunciations were strong and forceful. But he had also made clear his intentions to use Keegstra for other purposes. In a letter to one of the authors of a major study on the Keegstra affair, Mr. King declared:

> The 'Keegstra affair'...is significant not in itself, but rather for the window of opportunity it opened, which lent focus and power to a number of initiatives that had commenced in the years 1979-1982.[42]

There can be no better statement of the political uses of the Keegstra affair than the Minister's own words.

What are the implications of the Keegstra affair for those of us engaged in the study of educational administration and the professional preparation of school administrators? Those who run our schools and our school systems live their professional lives in an environment where the questions are not only, "What is right?" or "What is best?", but also and more often "What will they accept?", "What can realistically be accomplished?", and "What opportunities does this situation provide for other (and more important) things I'd like to see come about?" Successful accomplishment of one's goals in public education

depends upon political consciousness and political instincts. We can all think of examples from the institutions and school systems familiar to us. We must provide our would-be school administrators with the tools and the habit of political analysis.

But political sophistication alone will be futile -- a recipe for moral bankruptcy. The school administrators must closely involved in the Keegstra affair (the first superintendent, the two principals, and the Alberta Teachers' Association staff officer who advised and defended Keegstra without seeming to pay much attention to the content of his teaching) had the appropriate formal qualifications: graduate diplomas, master's degrees and, in the latter case, a doctorate in educational administration. But they do not appear to have been sufficiently well-enough informed (dare I say well-enough educated?) to recognize what was in front of them. Is it demanding too much that we insist that those entering our graduate programs in school administration are at least knowledgeable about the major events of modern history, their origins and their outcomes -- not to mention their own countries, their regions, their peoples, and their patterns of government? Is there room in educational administration for culture in the Arnoldian sense: "...acquainting ourselves with the best that has been known and said in the world, and thus with the history of the human spirit"?[43]

William Greenfield points out that few professional preparation programs for school administrators explicitly deal with the moral dimensions of administrative practice in schools.[44] But there is some hope. We are seeing discussions and symposia on values and ethics with increasing frequency in our professional meetings: a symposium at the most recent (1986) annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association entitled "Managerial Ethics: Right and Wrong in the Administrative Suite", for example; and the discussion of the

philosophy of Alasdair MacIntyre[45] and its implications for educational administration between Mark Holmes and Derek Allison at the 1984 meeting of the Canadian Society for the Study of Educational Administration.

MacIntyre, to oversimplify his thought, argues for a return to traditional Western values -- truth, courage, friendship, justice, all brought together in some overarching non-utilitarian concept of what is good. Holmes applies this directly to school administration:

> If educational administrators are to prefer one course of action to another, it must either be because it works better (i.e., the process is more effective, irrespective of one's goals and objectives) or because it is a better way, which requires some prior conception of good.[46]

Allison relates this directly to the importance indicated by school effectiveness research of a common vision or school philosophy which is taken seriously by principal and staff.[47] There does not seem to have been much of an informed vision of what a school could accomplish in the administrative offices of Eckville Junior-Senior High School.

The Alexandrian poet Cavafy wrote of the consternation which follows the discovery that the barbarians who threaten civilization are not to be found out in the frontier marches:

> Why this sudden unrest and confusion?
> (How solemn their faces have become.)
> Why are the streets and squares clearing quickly,
> and all return to their homes, so deep in thought?
>
> Because night is here, but the barbarians have not come.
> Some people arrived from the frontiers,
> and they said that there are no longer any barbarians.

> And now what shall become of us without any barbarians? Those people were a kind of solution.[48]

Allison further points out that the essence of the challenge which the traditionalist approach poses for our utilitarian positivist style of school administration

> ...lies in the extensive domination of our society by bureaucracy and the bureaucratic manager. A value-free, good-less monster that we have helped create and whose dominion we help perpetuate. Thus the final aspect of the challenge and promise of the traditionalist approach lies in the clarity with which it identifies and declares the amoral bureaucracy and its legions of managers to be the enemy of the Good. (Original emphasis.)[49]

He then cites MacIntyre:

> ...we too have reached that turning point...This time however the barbarians are not waiting beyond the frontiers; they have already been governing us for quite some time. And it is our lack of consciousness of this that constitutes part of our predicament.[50]

One of my colleagues, who has been engaged in the academic preparation of school administrators for many years, seems to have missed the point. He commented a few months ago that one of Keegstra's principals was "basically a competent administrator." Dare those of us who teach school administration look at ourselves in the mirror and ask what we are doing to give our students the knowledge and attitudes which will keep them from becoming MacIntyre's barbarians? James Keegstra's unimpeded decade in a social studies classroom points out how important that question really is.

Notes

1. The charge against Keegstra read as follows:
   > James Keegstra stands charged that he, between the 1st day of September A.D. 1978 and the 31st day of December A.D. 1982 inclusive, at or near the Town of Eckville in the Province of Alberta did wilfully promote hatred against an identifiable group, to wit: the Jewish people, by communicating statements while teaching to students at Eckville high school, contrary to the provisions of the Criminal Code.

2. Alberta. Proposals for an Industrial and Science Strategy for Albertans, 1985 to 1990 (Edmonton: Government of Alberta, 1984).

3. Details of Keegstra's teaching and its place in the stream of European and North American anti-semitism can be found in: David Bercuson and Douglas Wertheimer, A Trust Betrayed: The Keegstra Affair (Toronto: Doubleday Canada, 1985); and Steve Mertl and John Ward, Keegstra: The Issues, The Trial, The Consequences (Saskatoon:Western Producer Prairie Books, 1985).

4. For an account of the views and beliefs of Keegstra's former students, see Robert Mason Lee, "Keegstra's Children," Saturday Night 100 (May 1985):38-46.

5. Alberta Teachers' Association news release, April 20, 1983.

6. Reasons for Decision of the Board of Reference...In the Matter of the School Act...Between: James Keegstra, Appellant, and Board of Education For The County of Lacombe #14, Respondent. (Edmonton: Court of Queen's Bench, April 14, 1983).

7. Alberta. Teaching Profession Appeal Board. Reasons For Judgment...In the Matter of the Teaching Profession Act...And In the Matter of the Appeal of James Keegstra against the Finding and Recommendations of the Discipline Committee of Alberta Teachers' Association (Edmonton: Teaching Profession Appeal Board, February 15, 1984), p.23.

8. Walter Hughes, "Teachers Have No Unilateral Right To Set Curriculum," The ATA News, February 27, 1984.

9. Teaching Profession Appeal Board, p.24.

10. That section of the Criminal Code of Canada reads as follows:
    > 281.2 (1) Every one who, by communicating statements in any public place, incites hatred against any identifiable group where such incitement is likely to lead to a breach of the peace, is guilty of
    >
    > (a) an indictable offence and is liable to imprisonment for two years; or
    >
    > (b) an offence punishable on summary conviction.

(2) Every one who, by communicating statements, other than in private conversation, wilfully promotes hatred against any identifiable group is guilty of
(a) an indictable offence and is liable to imprisonment for two years; or
(b) an offence punishable on summary conviction.
(3) No person shall be convicted of an offence under subsection (2)
(a) if he establishes that the statements communicated were true;
(b) if, in good faith, he expressed or attempted to establish by argument an opinion on a religious subject;
(c) if the arguments were relevant to any subject of public interest, the discussion of which was for the public benefit, and if, on reasonable grounds he believed them to be true; or
(d) if, on good faith, he intended to point out, for the purpose of removal, matters producing or tending to produce feelings of hatred towards an identifiable group in Canada.

11. R. vs. Keegstra (1984), 19 C.C.C. (3d), 254.

12. Rick Groen, "Drama Hot Off The Presses Fails To Ignite On The Tube," Globe and Mail, December 7, 1985, p.C2.

13. Calgary Herald, December 14, 1985, p.A3.

14. Globe and Mail, June 23, 1986, p.A1.

15. Gerald T. McLeod, "The Work of School Board Chief Executive Officers," Canadian Journal of Education 9 (1984):171-190.

16. The question of particularism and universalism is a significant one in terms of local control of rural schools, and becomes more so as the overall level of education of school administrators (and the cosmopolitan orientation associated with it) increases with the proliferation of graduate programs in educational administration. See Alan Peshkin, "Whom Shall the Schools Serve: Some Dilemmas of Local Control in a Rural School District," Curriculum Inquiry 6 (1977):181-204.

17. Bercuson and Wertheimer, A Trust Betrayed, p.95.

18. "Laying Blame For Keegstra," Alberta Report, May 14, 1984, p.31.

19. Peter Bachrach and Morton S. Baratz, "Decisions And Nondecisions: An Analytical Framework." American Political Science Review 57(1963):641.

20. Mark Holmes. "The Revival In Traditional Thought And Its Effects On Educational Administration: The Case Of Decision-Making." Paper presented to the Canadian Association for the Study of Educational Administration, Montreal, May 1985, p.18.

21. Midge Decter, "Bitburg: Who Forgot What." Commentary 80(1985):21-27.

22. Hannah Arendt, Eichman in Jerusalem: A Report On The Banality of Evil (New York: The Viking Press, 1963).

23. Helen Fein, Accounting for Genocide: National Responses and Jewish Victimization During The Holocaust (New York: Free Press, 1979) p.3, p.33.

24. Robert Mason Lee, "Keegstra's Children."

25. Thomas B. Greenfield, "Leaders and Schools: Willfulness and Nonnatural Order in Organizations," in Leadership and Organizational Culture, Thomas J. Sergiovanni and John E. Corbally, eds. (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1984), p.160.

26. For a summary of the literature on the principal's role in achieving school effectiveness see K.A. Leithwood and D.J. Montgomery, "The Role of the Elementary School Principal in Program Improvement," Review of Educational Research 52(1982):309-339; Joan Shoemaker and Hugh W. Fraser, "What Principals Can Do: Some Implications From Studies of Effective Schooling," Phi Delta Kappan 64(1981):178-182; the papers collected in Educational Leadership 41,5(1984); and "The Role of The Principal in School Improvement." Special issue of Education and Urban Society 17,1(1984).

27. Van Cleve Morris, Robert L. Crowson, Cynthia Porter-Gehrie, and Emanuel Hurwitz, Jr., Principals in Action: The Reality of Managing Schools (Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill, 1984); Robert L. Crowson, "Managerial Ethics in Educational Administration: The Rational Choice Approach." Paper presented to the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, April 1986; Robert L. Crowson and Cynthia Porter-Gehrie, "The Discretionary Behavior of Principals in Large City Schools," Educational Administration Quarterly 16(1980):45-69; Arthur M. Schwartz, "Principals and Power: An Assessment of the Principal's Political Role," in The Politics of Canadian Education, J.H.A. Wallin, ed. (Ottawa: Canadian Society for the Study of Education, 1977); Harry F. Wolcott, The Man in the Principal's Office (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1973).

28. Rod Evans, "Authority in Educational Administration." Phenomenology and Pedagogy 3,2 (1985):101.

29. Thomas B. Greenfield, "Putting Meaning Back into Theory: The Search for Lost Values and the Disappeared Individual." Paper presented to the Canadian Society for the Study of Education, Montreal, May 1985, p.13.

30. Harry F. Wolcott, The Man in the Principal's Office, p.320. Martin Burlingame, "Some Neglected Dimensions in the Study of Educational Administration," Educational Administration Quarterly 15(1979):1-19; Malcolm Innes-Brown, "Thoughts on the Neglected Influence of Morality in Guiding the Development of Organizational Theory in Educational Administration," The Yellow Papers 5(1985):4-11.

31. Alberta Hansard, April 18, 1983, p.603.

32. Alberta Hansard, April 22, 1983, p.703.

33. For a discussion of populist anti-semitism in Alberta Social Credit, see Howard Palmer, Patterns of Prejudice: A History of Nativism in Alberta (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1982):152-158; and David Bercuson and Douglas Wertheimer, A Trust Betrayed, pp.9-10, pp.31-38.

34. Ten months later, another Conservative backbencher made a similar statement and then promptly apologized, apparently at the insistence of the Premier. Neither was renominated by his constituency for the 1986 provincial election. The second MLA's urban seat was taken by the Opposition.

35. Alberta. Committee on Tolerance and Understanding. Private Education in Alberta. Discussion Paper No. 1 (Edmonton: The Committee, 1984).

36. Alberta. Committee on Tolerance and Understanding. Native Education in Alberta. Discussion Paper No. 2 (Edmonton: The Committee, 1984) p.1.

37. Yaacov Glickman and Alan Bardikoff, The Treatment of The Holocaust In Canadian History and Social Science Textbooks (Downsview, Ontario: League For Human Rights of B'nai Brith Canada, 1982).

38. Alberta Education. Partners in Education: Principles For A New School Act (Edmonton: Alberta Education, 1985). Working papers had been available in education circles months earlier.

39. Teaching Profession Appeal Board, p.1.

40. In Canada, the provincial school trustees' associations are representative bodies for locally elected school boards. In most provinces, they are major institutional actors in educational politics, and important influences in the educational policy process.

41. Board of Reference, p.17.

42. Cited in David Bercuson and Douglas Wertheimer, A Trust Betrayed, p.191.

43. Matthew Arnold, Literature and Dogma. Preface to the 1873 edition.

44. William D. Greenfield, Jr. "The Moral Socialization of School Administrators: Informal Role Learning Outcomes." Educational Administration Quarterly 21(1985):99-119.

45. Alasdair C. MacIntyre, After Virtue: A Study in Moral Theory (Notre Dame, Indiana: University of Notre Dame Press, 1981); Mark Holmes, "Educational Administration After MacIntyre: Which Way Forward?"; Derek J. Allison, "Educational Administration After Holmes: Which Way Back?"

46. Mark Holmes, "Educational Administration After MacIntyre," p.18.

47. Derek J. Allison, "Educational Administration After Holmes," p.6.

48. Constantine Cavafy, "Expecting the Barbarians," The Complete Poems of C.P. Cavafy, trans. Rae Dalven (London: The Hogarth Press, 1961) p.19.

49. Derek J. Allison, "Educational Administration After Holmes," p.9.

50. Alasdair C. MacIntyre, After Virtue, p.245.